



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his readers into a world of fiction, yet it is the tendency of his writings to promote a love for the arts, for activity, for truth. They do not merely teach us to be satisfied with the world, but to bear with it, by showing how rich it is in the means of acquiring virtues, and of performing just and benevolent deeds.

ART. IV.—*The American Farmer, containing Original Essays and Selections on Rural Economy and Internal Improvements ; with Illustrative Engravings and the Prices Current of Country Produce.* JOHN S. SKINNER, Editor. 5 vols. 4to. Baltimore. 1821—1824.

THE wealth of a nation, and consequently the prosperity and happiness of the community, depend on three sources of industry, usually denominated agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial. The labored discussions into which political economists have entered, respecting the comparative importance of these modes, and the zeal with which each has been defended in preference to the other two, have been more frequently marked with local predilections and love of theory, than with consistency and broad views of the subject. In its general and abstract sense the topic cannot be discussed ; that is, it is wholly impossible to decide, upon any general principles, whether agriculture, manufacture, or commerce, affords the best field for human industry. A union of the three is essential to the well being, nay to the existence of civilised society, and it depends wholly on the circumstances of any particular country, or district, whether one or the other ought to receive the greatest degree of attention. A good government will take care to encourage them all, and to strengthen each in proportion as the others may be gaining an undue ascendancy ; and the largest amount of public happiness will be enjoyed by that nation, in which these several branches of industry flourish together, and with nearly an equal degree of activity.

It was the theory of a class of French writers on political economy, of whom Quesnai was at the head, that the only productive labor was that bestowed in cultivating the earth.

Agriculture alone they deemed the source of the increase of value or capital, which they supposed to constitute wealth. They did not deny that the manufacturer, who fashioned materials into other forms, gave them an additional value, but they maintained that this amounted to no more, than the value of what he consumed during the operation ; so that in reality nothing was added to the general stock of wealth. And as for merchandise, it was considered as a mere exchange, in which things of equal value were given for each other, and of course nothing was gained to the original mass. Till the time of Adam Smith this theory was supported with much pertinacity, and it was gravely and acutely argued, that whatever direction labor might take in accommodation to the order and progress of society, it actually produced nothing in the shape of wealth or capital, except when employed in the cultivation of the soil.

This theory is built on an unsound basis, a false notion of what constitutes wealth, and the value of effects produced by labor. What is the wealth of a community but the means of subsistence, comfort, happiness ? That nation, which has the ability to enjoy all these in the greatest degree is the richest ; and labor bestowed in any way to increase the comforts and conveniences of life, is at the same time enlarging the stock of national wealth in the same proportion. Agriculture contributes its due share in this work, but in no state of civilised society does it accomplish any more than a part. Agriculture alone would supply us with the necessities of life, the means of subsistence, and here its agency would stop. Shall we call this wealth, and the only valuable product of labor ? Do we not need raiment and shelter, and is there no value in these ? But the moment we begin to fabricate garments and build houses, we become manufacturers. Indeed, the agriculturalist himself must first manufacture, or procure to be manufactured, his implements of husbandry, or his labor will produce nothing. We thus see in the first place, that the product of agriculture is in itself but a small part of national wealth, and in the second place, that this cannot be made to minister even to the common necessities, much less the comforts and enjoyments of life, without the aid of manufacture. The result is very plain, that the theory of the economists has no foundation.

This conclusion will be confirmed by considering in what national wealth actually consists. As we have above hinted, everything, which can be converted by human agency into the effective means of social comfort, prosperity, and happiness, is so far an item of the wealth of the community in which it is found. The facilities possessed by a nation for obtaining the necessities and conveniences of life are its wealth; or, as Mr Raymond has expressed it in a single word, it consists in the *capacity* for attaining these ends. A nation has lands, navigable waters, roads, canals, portions of soil devoted to agriculture, streams giving motion to machinery, harbors, towns, and shipping suited to commerce, gold, silver, merchandise, and a healthy, industrious, intelligent, enterprising population engaged in all the numerous employments, which the organisation of society demands; these are its capacity for supplying the wants, and multiplying the comforts of life; these are its wealth. Labor, or efficient industry, is undoubtedly the most important element of this wealth, for it is by this that all the other elements are made productive.

The theory of Adam Smith differs not in reality from that of the economists. He states it in different terms, and under a modified aspect, but when pursued to its natural limits it will run to the same extreme. He divides labor into two kinds, which he calls *productive* and *unproductive*; the former denotes that labor, which produces a raw material, or adds to the saleable value of a material already produced; the latter is that which leaves nothing behind it, but whose effects terminate with the exertion. The practical agriculturist and mechanic are productive laborers, because they add a permanent value to some existing material; whereas the house servant, or the man employed merely for the convenience or gratification of others, is an unproductive laborer; he does not increase the aggregate amount of value in the community, nor of course the general stock of wealth.

The unsoundness of this theory will be perceived, when we attempt to draw the line between what the author's principles would distinguish as productive and unproductive labor. Where shall this line be drawn? Dr Smith says between that labor, which adds value to some material, and that which adds none. But why fix the limit here? The author would

reply, because the first kind of labor increases value and thus accumulates wealth. Here is the fallacy. What he calls the wealth of a nation is wealth, it is true, but it is only a part of the whole, and other parts are to be sought in other sources, one of which is what he denominates unproductive labor. All labor is productive, which promotes the end it designs, and when this end is a benefit to the laborer himself, or to any other individual, it has value, and as far as it ministers to the wants or comforts society, or any members of society, it is an item of the general wealth. The labor of the servant is as really productive labor as that of the cultivator, or the cotton spinner, but in a different way. It produces the means of living for himself, and the means of comfort for his employer, and for every person, who is benefited by his services. That is, it adds to the mass of national wealth, not in food, or clothing, or any kind of manufactured fabrics, but in keeping up the order of society, and increasing the happiness of human existence to a certain number of individuals. So with the professional musician ; his labor accumulates nothing ; it produces the means of his own subsistence, and gives pleasure to others ; or, in other words, it produces such results, in regard to human enjoyment, as accumulated wealth would produce. The same may be said of other professions, employed in preserving the intercourse of society. They add nothing to the amount of agricultural or manufactured products, they bring no new combinations of matter into existence, yet it would be a great error to say that they are unproductive, since they are among the principal agents of social order and comfort.

Hence the distinction set up by Dr Smith between different kinds of labor does not exist. The labor, which he calls unproductive, has the same properties, and produces the same effects, as that denominated productive. The purposes of social being are equally promoted by both. The division itself is arbitrary, and, if made at all, can be fixed only at one point, and that is between agricultural and all other kinds of labor. At this point the difference is sufficiently marked, inasmuch as agricultural labor is especially productive in bringing something out of the soil, which did not exist before, and thus increasing the quantity of available materials ; whereas, every other kind of labor only modifies these mate-

rials, or puts them into new shapes, and thus gives them a value by changing their forms, and not by producing their substance. In this arbitrary sense the terms productive and unproductive may possibly be used as applied to labor. The theory will then be identical with that of the economists, referring all productive labor and substantial wealth to agriculture alone.

To this extreme Dr Smith was evidently unwilling to be carried; but, although he attempts to controvert the doctrine of the economists, his principles lead to it, and the force of his illustrations is mainly derived from their tendency to confirm it. He estimates the value of agricultural labor as greatly superior to that of any other, because 'in agriculture nature labors along with man,' whereas 'in manufactures nature does nothing, man does all.' The product of this work of nature in agriculture he considers as net gain, not to be derived from labor employed in any other pursuit. It is on this ground, that he ascribes to agriculture the chief power in producing wealth, and thus leaves his theory open to all the objections urged against the economists. His mistake consists in limiting to agriculture what he calls the labor of nature, when in reality nature works as much for the artist, the mechanic, and the mariner, as for the farmer. Let it be acknowledged that nature works in the fertilising principle of the earth, and in bringing to maturity the products of the soil; it must also be allowed, that she works equally for the mechanic in sustaining the properties of matter, and enabling it to be wrought into such forms as skill or fancy may dictate. She works for the manufacturer by upholding the mechanical powers, and by lending her streams, the agency of her fires, and her great law of attraction, to put his machinery in motion, and give efficiency to his enterprise. She supplies the bounties of her forests, her mines, and fields to the shipwright, and freely offers her waves and her winds to waft the goods of the merchant from one clime to another in obedience to his will. In short, without the helping hand of nature nothing could be brought to pass; she works everywhere and at all times, and that is a fallacious theory, which claims her partiality to any particular branch of human exertion. If she does more for one than another, it is because a superior in-

genuity succeeds in gaining a more effectual control over her agency.

There are two things, which give advantages to manufacturing industry, not common to the other branches ; first, the *multiplication of machinery* ; and, secondly, the *division of labor*. In modern times these have been carried to a great extent, and are every day increasing. Simple machinery, constructed at a comparatively small expense, and kept in motion by water power, is made to perform the labor of a vast many hands, thus leaving to be turned into other channels a large portion of labor, which, without the aid of improved machinery, would be required to produce the same effects. This advantage has no limit, as machinery may be multiplied indefinitely, and the power of putting it in motion, either by water or steam, is inexhaustible. The division of labor creates skill, and rapidity of operation, by concentrating all the powers of mind and habit within a small compass, and thus enabling a certain number of men, by assigning to each a particular department, to accomplish more in a given time, than it would be possible for them to do, if each were employed in constructing the entire fabric.

Now these advantages, immense as they are in saving labor, are nearly confined to manufacture. The division of labor, it is true, is necessary to a certain degree in mercantile transactions, and the use of machinery adds something to the facilities of shipbuilding, yet the benefits to be derived from these sources are within a narrow space, and can never be extended far. And in regard to agriculture, the same remark will have still more force. Machinery here can do very little under any circumstances ; the implements of husbandry must always be simple, and such as will require a large portion of manual labor to use them with effect. Nor in cultivating the earth can the division of labor take place to such an extent, as to produce much benefit ; the change of seasons, and the nature of the employment, render it necessary for the practical farmer to be engaged at different times in all the branches of his profession. It thus appears, that in the means of creating value, and increasing national wealth, with the least amount of labor, manufacture possesses in some respects a decided advantage over the two other branches of industry.

This advantage is doubtless sometimes balanced by others pertaining to agriculture and commerce, but not universally. Political changes may give facilities for profitable commercial enterprise, which the manufacturer does not possess, and an uncommonly fruitful season may enlarge the average income of the farmer. The manufacturer is not affected by incidents of this nature, any farther than they produce a fluctuation in the market, and this is as likely to operate against him, as in his favor. These remarks apply to the different branches of industry, as they relate to individuals engaged in them, but when we look at each in a national point of view, we shall find that the results of commerce have an importance by no means to be surpassed by those of either of the other branches. Society is itself a system of exchanges, and although we would not say with Count Destutt Tracy, that 'commerce is the whole of society,' any more than we would assent to his position, that 'labor is the whole of riches,' yet we may venture to say, that all the main operations of society are carried on by commerce. A thing is valuable to us, because we can exchange it for something else, which we value more; and whether the exchange is made in our own neighborhood, or on the other side of the ocean, the benefit is the same to us, and the purposes of life are equally answered. If a man could not exchange the proceeds of his labor, for the proceeds of the labor of others, which he wants more, he would gain nothing by society, nor receive any equivalent for the independence he resigns in submitting to the social compact.

The advantages of a national commerce reach to the most trivial interests of society; it stimulates every species of industry; the farmer labors and thrives, because the merchant is ready to take his surplus produce, and give in exchange articles more valuable to him. The manufacturer works for the merchant, and if commerce or exchange should stop, his labor and his profits would be at an end. Commerce aids the successful prosecution of manufacture, the fabrics of which must be widely dispersed, before they can come into the hands of the consumers. Besides, the great advantages above described, as peculiar to manufacturing industry, can only be enjoyed in proportion as an outlet shall be found for manufactured products. A limit would be fixed to the multiplication of ma-

chinery and the division of labor, unless a thriving commerce should always be prepared to take off the surplus articles produced beyond the demand of the immediate vicinity of the place of manufacture. Commerce not only affords employment, subsistence, and comfort, to the large portion of population engaged in its concerns, but contributes most largely to the general wealth and prosperity, strength and happiness of every country where it is pursued, by taking away such of its products as are not wanted, finding the best market for them, and returning in their room articles esteemed of more value, and producing a greater amount of social enjoyment. Industry is quickened, habits of activity encouraged, and the powers of body and mind stimulated to a more vigorous, healthful, effective exercise.

But whatever may be thought of the comparative importance of these three branches of general industry, it will not be doubted, that each is essential to the political well being of a people, and that improvement in either or all of them should be hailed as favorable to the public good. Indeed, so close is their dependence on each other, that the gaining prosperity of one is a sufficient indication of the successful progress of the other two; agriculture must languish, if the active spirit of manufacture does not remove as fast as produced its surplus raw materials, and manufacture and commerce must flag, if the supplies of agriculture are not adequate to their demands. It is plain that agriculture is the basis of the other two, and although it does not follow, that a wise policy would bestow any extraordinary encouragement on this branch at the expense of the others, inasmuch as the state of greatest prosperity is that in which they are all mutually and equally active, yet, as the art of husbandry, like every other art, is susceptible of continued advancement, any exertions made to this end by individuals or classes of men are highly honorable and meritorious. In this country, in particular, where land is so abundant, and the labors of the agriculturalist are diffused over so wide a space, and expended with so little regard to system or methodical principles, the talents and time of any one can hardly be devoted to a better service, than that of inculcating a spirit of improvement in agriculture, by collecting and making known the results of experience, drawing the attention of practical farmers to subjects of useful inquiry, leading each

to profit by the knowledge and attainments of the others, and thus teaching the art of extracting from the soil the greatest quantity of products, with the smallest expenditure of labor.

It is with this view of the subject, that we are inclined to approve highly the agricultural work, published by Mr Skinner in Baltimore, entitled the *American Farmer*. This journal was commenced in April, 1819, in a weekly quarto sheet, and five volumes have already been given to the public. It may be stated as no equivocal test of its merits, that within the above period three editions of some of the earlier volumes have been printed, and that the demand is increasing.

It has been the editor's plan to collect from all parts of the United States such facts as he could, on practical agriculture and domestic economy, and also to give short notices of the latest agricultural improvements in Europe. In looking over the pages of his journal we have been struck with his success, particularly in executing that part of his plan relating to this country. His industry has been unwearied in bringing together facts from every quarter of the union, derived from the highest sources, and almost uniformly possessing a strictly practical value. They are commonly drawn from the experience of eminent farmers, expressed in their own language, and accompanied with such judicious remarks, as add to their inherent value.

The work contains, also, many well written essays on the theory and general principles of agriculture, as well as on the economy of its particular departments, and in these will often be found decided marks of scholarship and science, no less than of observation and research. It is Mr Skinner's principal aim, however, to collect and communicate facts, and thus to convince the cautious, hesitating farmer what may be done, by proving to him what has been done. In this aim he judges rightly; the force of habit is to be broken before improvement can be expected, and in nothing, perhaps, is habit more tyrannical and obstinate, than in traditionary modes of agriculture. Reason, and speculation, and theory will do little towards conquering these. Repeated appeals to the senses, and reiteration of facts, touching at the same time the springs of interest, will at last make an impression, and unclothe the eyes which prejudice had sealed. Farmers must see the path broad, and plain, and open, before they will venture to

walk in it, however intricate or unpromising may be the old one to which they are accustomed. This mode of combining the scattered results, which experience has brought to light in solitary instances, and putting into the hands of individuals the power of profiting by the practical skill and knowledge of numbers, affords the best and perhaps the only means of awakening attention, and ensuring a general improvement.

In looking over the volumes of this work, and comparing the contents of different parts, especially the first volume with the last, it is evident that it has excited much inquiry and a spirit of observation among the farmers at the south, and turned the thoughts of many to a more careful and scientific culture. Excellent communications on subjects of husbandry are more numerous as the work advances, and minute details of the modes of successful cultivation, or of new and interesting experiments are more frequent. There are full accounts, in the shape of essays and remarks, scattered throughout the work, on the various methods of cultivating the staple commodities of the country, such as wheat, cotton, tobacco, and Indian corn, which cannot fail to be of great utility, by reason of their almost universal application. The raising of cattle, the growth of garden vegetables, the properties of different soils, the best modes of enriching lands and adapting them to particular products, these, and every other topic connected with the business of practical farming, are discussed in their due measure with such degrees of accuracy and intelligence, as the editor has been able to attain by his zeal, industry, and perseverance, through a wide correspondence. Well executed drawings are also frequently given of models, machines, agricultural implements, and of animals remarkable for their breed or other characteristics.

On the list of contributors we observe the names of some of our most eminent men in all parts of the union, whose labors it is gratifying to contemplate in the peaceful walks of agriculture, after the years of care and toil, which they have spent in the high duties of political life, gaining the independence and securing the glory and happiness of a nation. The work, it would seem, is particularly patronised by agricultural societies, which are springing up in many places, and which make this paper the vehicle of their communications to the public, and some of which have chosen its volumes as agri-

cultural premiums. The legislature of North Carolina has recently authorised an appropriation, to be expended in purchasing a certain number of copies for the use of the state. These testimonies are such as would of themselves prove its importance and growing influence ; and it is to be hoped, that Mr Skinner will daily find the rewards of his enterprise increased by the increasing circulation of his journal, and that his success will be such, as to encourage him to pursue his task with the same indefatigable exertions, which have hitherto characterised his labors.

In closing these remarks, we cannot refrain from presenting our readers with the following beautiful and and eloquent passage from Mr Biddle's Address before the Philadelphia Society for promoting Agriculture, which is printed in the fourth volume of the *American Farmer*.

‘ If I have failed to prove,’ says Mr Biddle, ‘ that the pursuits of agriculture may be as lucrative as other employments, it will be an easier task to vindicate their pleasures and their importance. I need not dwell on that retirement, one of the purest enjoyments of this life, and the best preparation for the future, on those healthful occupations, on that calmness of mind, on that high spirit of manliness and independence, which naturally belong to that condition. These are attractions which must have deep roots in the human heart, since they have in all times fascinated at once the imagination and won the judgment of men. But I may be allowed to say, that in this nation agriculture is probably destined to attain its highest honors, and that the country life of America ought to possess peculiar attractions. The pure and splendid institutions of this people have embodied the brightest dreams of those high spirits, who in other times and in other lands have lamented or struggled against oppression ; they have realised the fine conceptions which speculative men have imagined, which wise men have planned, or brave men vainly perished in attempting to establish. Their influence in reclaiming the lost dignity of man, and inspiring the loftiest feelings of personal independence, may be traced in every condition of our citizens ; but as all objects are most distinct by insulation, their effects are peculiarly obvious in the country.

‘ The American farmer is the exclusive, absolute, uncontrolled proprietor of the soil. His tenure is not from the government ; the government derives its power from him. There is above him nothing but God and the laws ; no hereditary authority usurping the distinctions of personal genius ; no established church spreading its dark shadow between him and heaven. His frugal government neither desires nor dares to oppress the soil ; and the altars of reli-

gion are supported only by the voluntary offerings of sincere piety. His pursuits, which no perversion can render injurious to any, are directed to the common benefit of all. In multiplying the bounties of Providence, in the improvement and embellishment of the soil, in the care of the inferior animals committed to his charge, he will find an ever varying and interesting employment, dignified by the union of liberal studies, and enlivened by the exercise of a simple and generous hospitality. His character assumes a loftier interest by its influence over the public liberty. It may not be foretold to what dangers this country is destined, when its swelling population, its expanding territory, its daily complicating interests, shall awake the latent passions of men, and reveal the vulnerable points of our institutions. But whenever these perils come, its most steadfast security, its unfailing reliance will be on that column of landed proprietors, the men of the soil and of the country, standing aloof from the passions which agitate denser communities, well educated, brave, and independent, the friends of the government without soliciting its favors, the advocates of the people without descending to flatter their passions; these men, rooted like their own forests, may yet interpose between the factions of the country, to heal, to defend, and to save.²

These views are full of interest, and afford abundant materials for serious reflection. When we look at the moral bearing of the three branches of industry, their comparative power over intellect, virtue, character, habit, they stand at a wide distance asunder. Agriculture undoubtedly takes precedence far above the other two, in its salutary influence on the mind, the heart, the affections, and indeed on all the principles, which adorn and dignify human nature. Agriculturalists pursue their labors singly; they are seldom thrown together so closely, as to be subject to the irritating circumstances incident to people living in compact bodies, where every evil passion finds nourishment, and the contagion of vice spreads rapidly, and sinks deeply into many hearts unprepared to resist its attacks, and unconscious of its secret ravages. It is a remark of Mr Jefferson, in his notes on Virginia, that ‘corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon, of which no age nor nation has furnished an example.’ That history will bear out this remark in its fullest latitude we doubt not, for it accords with reason and the nature of things. In regard to manufacture, to say nothing of its effects on morals, which are allowed on all hands not to be favorable, its tendency is to narrow and degrade the mind.

It converts man into a machine, in which no more intellect is necessary, than enough to direct its physical motions. The division of labor, from which manufacture receives one of its main advantages, operates directly to confine the range of the mind, and compel all its powers to act on a single object, however minute or insignificant. The point of Mr Say's observation, that 'to have never done anything but make the eighteenth part of a pin is a sorry account for a human being to give of his existence,' will apply with more or less force to the whole compass of manufacturing industry. Men must necessarily degenerate in such a soil. This is an evil not to be avoided, and since the interests of society require it to exist, it is the part of sound policy and humanity to diminish it as much as possible by wise regulations, and an effort to direct labor into its most salutary, as well as its most profitable channels.

ART. IV.—1. *The Orlando Innamorato; translated into Prose and Verse, from the Italian of Francesco Berni.* By W. S. ROSE. 8vo. pp. 279. London, 1823.

2. *The Orlando Furioso; translated into Verse from the Italian of Ludovico Ariosto.* By W. S. ROSE. Vol. 1. 8vo. London, 1823.

MR ROSE has been known for some years to his own countrymen as an original poet, and an accomplished Italian scholar. For the former character he is indebted to a little mock chivalric poem, entitled, 'Prospectus of an intended National Work, by W. & R. Whistlecraft.' This fraction of an epic, for it has not been completed, has passed through four or five editions in England. It is written in the style of Lord Byron's Beppo. It is said, that Mr Rose's poem was composed, though not published, before his Lordship's.* If

* Mr Rose sent a copy of his poem to Murray, who doubting its success with the public, transmitted it to Lord Byron then in Venice, requesting his opinion of it. His Lordship returned it in a very short time with his own 'Beppo,' telling his publisher, that he found the only way of getting Rose's rhymes out of his head, was to write something in the same way himself. Beppo was